R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 185 FL 000 381

NDEA INSTITUTES, SUMMER 1961--A SURVEY.

BY- WALSH, DONALD D.

PUB DATE APR 64

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.24 6P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EVALUATION, *INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, *MODERN LANGUAGES, INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *PRESERVICE EDUCATION, TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, NDEA LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

QUESTIONNAIRE DATA FROM A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF NDEA LANGUAGE INSTITUTES ON PARTICIPANTS WERE SUMMARIZED. INCLUDED WERE THE RATINGS GIVEN BY THE PARTICIPANTS FOR THE INSTITUTE INSTRUCTION AND FOR THEIR PREVIOUS COLLEGE TRAINING, AND REPORTED STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE INSTITUTE PROGRAM. RATINGS FOR INSTRUCTION IN LISTENING COMPREHENSION, SPEAKING, READING, WRITING, LINGUISTICS, CULTURE, LABORATORY, AND METHODS WERE SUMMARIZED IN STATISTICAL TABLES AND WERE INTERPRETED. ALSO REPORTED WERE THE WAYS IN WHICH THE INSTITUTE EXPERIENCE RESULTED IN THE PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT OF THE PARTICIPANTS. THIS ARTICLE IS A REPRINT FROM "THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL," VOLUME 48, NUMBER 4, APRIL 1964. (AM)

ED011185

NDEA INSTITUTES, SUMMER 1961: A SURVEY

BY

DONALD D. WALSH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL 000 381

Reprinted from
THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL
Vol. XLVIII, No. 4, April, 1964

*NDEA Institutes, Summer 1961: A Survey**

DONALD D. WALSH, *Modern Language Association*

AS PART of an evaluation of National Defense Language Institutes undertaken in 1963 by the Modern Language Association under contract with the U. S. Office of Education, an attempt was made to assess the effect of the Institute experience on a representative group of participants. Summer 1961 Institutes were chosen for a fall 1963 inquiry; the experience was recent enough for memories to be fresh and yet far enough in the past to allow some perspective and some time for the experience to have its effect. Questionnaires were

* Though this report will no doubt also appear in journals of constituent associations of The National Federation of Foreign Language Teachers Associations, I agree with the author that "the findings have interest and validity for all teachers of modern foreign languages" and, therefore, should be given the widest distribution.—R.F.R.

sent to 1482 participants in Institutes for teachers of Spanish and French. Of these, 505 (34.1%) were returned as undeliverable, "address unknown," a significant indication of the amount of job shifting or dropping by secondary-school teachers. Presumably delivered but not returned were 199 questionnaires (13.4%), which left 778 usable returns, 52.5% of the original mailing, or 79.6% of those presumably received.[1]

We invited free criticism of the Institute that each participant had attended in 1961. Among the weaknesses mentioned with some frequency were two foreign languages in one Institute, the amount of English used by participants, the load of daytime and evening activities, and the failure to get homogeneous groups either by screening applicants before acceptance or by sectioning according to ability at the beginning of the session. Among the needs only partly fulfilled in some Institutes were training in operating a language laboratory, a practical linguistics course, and practice in listening and speaking.

Participants were asked to rate the quality of instruction they received at the Institute in eight areas, and to rate, on the same scale and in the same areas, their own academic preparation. They used a scale with four degrees, Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor. Here are their ratings, with percentages,[2] of the quality of their Institute instruction and of their college and university instruction.

A comparison of the two sets of ratings shows a quite good correspondence between the weaknesses of the participants' academic training and the strengths of their Institute programs. In linguistics and laboratory they rated their preparation very weak or nonexistent and their preparation in listening, speaking, and methods clearly less than good. In the foreign culture, nearly three fifths of them felt that their preparation had been excellent or good, in writing, nearly three quarters and in reading, nearly ninety per cent. The highest ratings for the Institute training were in listening, speaking, culture, and methods, followed at some distance by laboratory and linguistics. Reading and writing understandably rated lowest, because the participants were strongest in these skills and less attention therefore needed to be given to them.

When asked to indicate any areas where their academic preparation was weak, they named reading (3), writing (12), culture (33), linguistics (90), methods (90), laboratory (95), and audio-lingual training (292). When asked which Institute features might be profitably

[1] I am deeply indebted to B. Q. Morgan, Professor Emeritus of German at Stanford, who, during one of his periodic voluntary work sessions in our office, completed the tabulation of the answers to the questionnaire.

[2] Not every participant rated every area, and the percentages in each case are based on the total number of ratings in the area.

RATINGS OF INSTITUTE INSTRUCTION

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*
Listening Comp.	455 (59.2)	257 (33.5)	50 (6.5)	6 (.8)
Speaking	436 (56.1)	253 (32.6)	72 (9.3)	15 (2.0)
Reading	173 (22.6)	307 (40.1)	194 (25.4)	91 (11.9)
Writing	131 (17.1)	298 (39.0)	214 (28.0)	121 (15.9)
Linguistics	305 (39.3)	228 (29.4)	151 (19.5)	91 (11.8)
Culture	480 (61.8)	225 (29.0)	52 (6.7)	19 (2.5)
Laboratory	301 (38.7)	279 (37.0)	137 (17.6)	59 (7.7)
Methods, Prac. Teaching, etc.	443 (56.9)	221 (28.4)	86 (11.1)	28 (3.6)

RATINGS OF ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*
Listening Comp.	133 (17.9)	178 (24.0)	189 (25.5)	241 (32.6)
Speaking	100 (13.7)	149 (20.6)	198 (27.3)	278 (38.4)
Reading	359 (48.8)	292 (39.7)	63 (8.6)	21 (2.9)
Writing	240 (32.0)	314 (41.8)	153 (20.4)	43 (5.8)
Linguistics	35 (4.7)	55 (7.4)	103 (14.0)	545 (73.9)
Culture	174 (23.6)	264 (35.9)	168 (22.8)	130 (17.7)
Laboratory	19 (2.5)	36 (4.9)	36 (4.9)	646 (87.7)
Methods, Prac. Teaching, etc.	112 (15.1)	186 (25.2)	143 (19.4)	297 (40.3)

adapted to regular college teaching (a question that is the converse of the preceding one) they named reading (4), a coordinated program (5), writing (7), a demonstration class (36), culture (53), linguistics (99), methods (111), laboratory (122), audio-lingual training in general (174) and in particular: language tables (13), language houses (16), foreign-language lectures, films, and other activities (20), and native informants (32). The blanket answer that *all* Institute features should be adapted was given by 62 participants.

In answer to one of the questions, participants indicated that the Institute experience had resulted in an increase in salary: 155 (19.9%), a move to a better school: 124 (15.9%) a chairmanship: 71 (9.1%), an invitation to teach in a subsequent NDEA Institute: 18 (2.3%), some other summer school: 36 (4.6%), or a workshop: 33 (4.2%). There was a space to indicate any other special assignment or advantage, and among the ones most frequently mentioned were the chance to teach a full program of FL classes (29), membership in state FL committees (15), the opportunity to teach advanced classes, including Advanced Placement classes (14), writing curriculum guides and workshop syllabi (12), setting up a new laboratory installation (13), giving talks on new teaching methods (16), teaching methods courses and demonstration classes (18), serving as supervising teacher (8), and teaching in-service or workshop courses (8).

The questionnaire ended at this point. Although I had not had the foresight to ask for general comments, quite a few of the participants seized the opportunity to make one. There were complaints from five teachers who did not win admission to a Level II Institute, and from three who were lonesome without their spouses during their Level I Institute. But all the rest of these unsolicited comments were filled with praise and gratitude. Here is a grouping into rough categories: "Helped me tremendously in my teaching, gave me greater vision and a desire to continue to improve" (44), "One of the most rewarding experiences of my life" (36), "An enormous increase in my feeling of professional adequacy" (30), "My students have profited greatly from the improvement in my teaching ability" (28), "A marvellous experience. Every FL teacher should get this chance. It changed my whole attitude" (25), "I learned more French [or Spanish] that summer than in all of my school and college courses" (6), "I am an infinitely better teacher because of the Institute" (33), "A great increase in my incentive to go on learning and investigating new materials" (12), "Increased enthusiasm for teaching" (18), "Greater efficiency in my own teaching and in guiding others in my department in using new methods and materials" (26).

The returns to this questionnaire clearly show that the Institute experience is a valuable one and that it should be continued as long as there is an emergency, which means as long as young Americans are being badly taught by inadequately trained teachers of modern foreign languages. This retraining is a responsibility of the NDEA. Let us not forget that the concurrent responsibility of our profession is to train the future language teachers that are now in our colleges so well that we shall in the foreseeable future be able to declare that the emergency is over and that the well trained need no retraining.